arXiv:0901.0301v1 [astro-ph.GA] 3 Jan 2009

Loss cone refilling by flyby encounters

A numerical study of massive black holes in galactic centres

Mimi Zhang

Wolfson College
University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the subject of Theoretical Astrophysics

Trinity Term 2008

©2008 - Mimi Zhang

All rights reserved.

Loss cone refilling by flyby encounters

A numerical study of massive black holes in galactic centres

Mimi Zhang
Wolfson College

Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics
University of Oxford

Abstract

A gap in phase-space, the loss cone (LC), is opened up by a supermassive black hole (MBH) as it disrupts or accretes stars in a galactic centre. If a star enters the LC then, depending on its properties, its interaction with the MBH will either generate a luminous electromagnetic flare or give rise to gravitational radiation, both of which are expected to have directly observable consequences. A thorough understanding of loss-cone refilling mechanisms is important for the prediction of astrophysical quantities, such as rates of tidal disrupting main-sequence stars, rates of capturing compact stellar remnants and timescales of merging binary MBHs. If a galaxy were isolated and perfectly spherical, the only refilling mechanism would be diffusion due to weak two-body encounters between stars. This would leave the LC always nearly empty. However, real galaxies are neither perfectly spherical nor isolated. In this thesis, we use N-body simulations to investigate how noise from accreted satellites and other substructures in a galaxy's halo can affect the LC refilling rate.

Any N-body model suffers from Poisson noise which is similar to, but much stronger than, the two-body diffusion occurring in real galaxies. To lessen this spurious Poisson noise, we apply the idea of importance sampling to develop a new scheme for constructing N-body realizations of a galaxy model, in which interesting regions of phase-space are sampled by many low-mass particles. This scheme minimizes the mean-square formal errors of a given set of projections of the galaxy's phase-space distribution function. Tests show that the method works very well in practice, reducing the diffusion coefficients by a factor of $\sim$ 100 compared to the standard equal-mass models and reducing the spurious LC flux in isolated model galaxies to manageably low levels.

We use multimass N-body models of galaxies with centrally-embedded MBHs to study the effects of satellite flybys on LC refilling rates. The total mass accreted by the MBH over the course of one flyby can be described, using a simple empirical fitting formula that depends on the satellite's mass and orbit. Published large-scale cosmological simulations yield predictions about the distribution of substructure in galaxy halos. We use results of these together with our empirical fitting formula to obtain an upper bound on substructure-driven LC refilling rates in real galaxies. We find that although the flux of stars into the initially emptied LC is enhanced, but the fuelling rate averaged over the entire subhalos is increased by only a factor 3 over the rate one expects from the Poisson noise due the discreteness of the stellar distribution.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Trinity Term 2008

Contents

Title Page i
Abstract iii
Table of Contents iv
Acknowledgments vii

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Supermassive black holes in galactic centres 3
1.1.1 Energy arguments for MBHs in AGNs 3
1.1.2 Loss of stars in the loss cone 3
1.1.3 How to feed stars to a loss cone? 3

2 Dynamical modelling **4**
2.1 Equilibrium model 5
2.1.1 DFs for collisionless stellar system 5
2.1.2 Collisionless Boltzmann equation 5
2.1.3 Preliminaries 5
2.2 N-body modelling 5
2.2.1 Monte Carlo integration 5
2.2.2 The CBE and N-body simulations 5
2.3 Departure from equilibrium 5
2.3.1 Collision terms 5
2.3.2 Fokker-Planck equation 5
2.3.3 Relaxation time 5

3 Multi-mass schemes for collisionless simulations **6**
3.1 Collisionless N-body simulations 9
3.1.1 N-body simulations and the CBE 9
3.1.2 How to fight against small N limitations? 9

- 3.2 Formulation . . . 9
  - 3.2.1 Observables . . . 9
  - 3.2.2 Optimal sampling scheme . . . 9
  - 3.2.3 ICs for N-body model . . . 9
- 3.3 Comparisons of a bulge model (no MBH) . . . 9
  - 3.3.1 Formal errors . . . 9
  - 3.3.2 How well is the acceleration field reproduced? . . . 9
  - 3.3.3 How well are integrals of motion conserved? . . . 9
- 3.4 Simulations of a bulge + MBH model . . . 9
  - 3.4.1 N-body realizations . . . 9
  - 3.4.2 Results: diffusion in J^2 . . . 9

4 Loss cone refilling by flyby encounters 10

- 4.1 Loss cone refilling by two-body relaxation . . . 11
- 4.2 Flyby encounters . . . 11
  - 4.2.1 Tests: calibrating noise-driven LC refilling . . . 11
  - 4.2.2 Experiments: measuring perturber-driven LC refilling . . . 11
  - 4.2.3 Results: an empirical $M_{\rm lc}$ formula . . . 11
  - 4.2.4 Discussion . . . 11
- 4.3 Where do LC stars come from? . . . 11
  - 4.3.1 Angular-momentum transport by satellite torque . . . 11
  - 4.3.2 Resonances from perturbation theory . . . 11
  - 4.3.3 Test-particle experiments of a periodic perturber . . . 11

5 Rates of MBH feeding in bulge-halo systems 12

- 5.1 Modelling a Milky-way sized halo and its substructures . . . 13
- 5.2 LC flux driven by noisy DM clumps . . . 13
- 5.3 Discussions . . . 13

6 Conclusions and future studies 14

- 6.1 Constructing collisionless galaxy models . . . 15
- 6.2 Rates of loss cone refilling by MBHs . . . 17

Bibliography 21

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Dr. John Magorrian for providing me with a complicated jumbo holiday, for supporting me with constant entertainments, and for sharing with me the rewarding experience. My acknowledgments go to this fearless leader who draws me into galactic dynamics and gets me into N-body simulations. No matter where I go, I will live with the courage he implants in me. All along the way, I have had good fortune to learn *Galactic Dynamics* with its author James Binney.

I owe a debt to Andy, who is instrumental in getting my programing started as a project. The “Beecroft institute” of Ralf, Rachel, Sarah, Andy, Michael, Ben, Callum have been great about sharing experience. And it is my duty to thank Dorothy Hodgkin Postgraduate PPARC-BP Awards for the financial support.

As seeming to languish for the last four years, I have challenged my willingness to see if I can lose my assumptions. Replace my empty mind with an open one, and return with my empty mind in the end. What a failure and what an achievement!

I dedicate this thesis to my mother and father who cherish me more than I do, and vice versa.

M^{2}Z

Oxford, June, 2008

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the *high-redshift* universe, massive black holes (MBHs) have been implicated as the powerhouses for quasars in the Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) paradigm; in the *nearby* galaxies, the existence of dead quasar engines has also been supported by modern stellar-dynamical searches (e.g., Ferrarese & Ford 2005). Over three dozens of local detections have unveiled the demographics of MBH populations such as a tight correlation between MBH *mass* and galactic *velocity dispersion* (e.g., Gebhardt et al. 2000; Ferrarese & Merritt 2000; Merritt & Ferrarese 2001), and a less tight correlation between MBH mass and the mass/luminosity of the *bulge* (e.g. Kormendy & Richstone 1995; Magorrian et al. 1998; Marconi & Hunt 2003). While efforts to build a larger and statistically significant sample continue, it is time to understand the origin, evolution and cosmic relevance of these fascinating objects.

The subject is large and my space is limited. In this thesis, I concentrate on developing and using N-body models to learn more about the stellar dynamics in galactic centres, especially around the MBHs. I begin immediately below by reviewing the "journey" to the MBHs: from the AGN paradigm-mandated MBHs as power sources to the observationsupported MBHs. Then, I describe two astrophysical ingredients: electromagnetic flares by tidal disruption of main-sequence stars and gravitational wave signals by capture of compact stars. Next, I explain the emptiness of “loss cone” and the starvation of the MBH which motivate the work in thesis. Finally, I outline briefly N-body modelling procedures developed in the subsequent chapters.

1.1 Supermassive black holes in galactic centres

1.1.1 Energy arguments for MBHs in AGNs

1.1.2 Loss of stars in the loss cone

1.1.3 How to feed stars to a loss cone?

Declaration

Chapter 2

Dynamical modelling

Galaxies, as self-gravitating systems, can be idealized as configurations of point mass fully described by a phase-space distribution function (DF) $f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}, t)$. The mass distribution determines the gravitational field[through Poisson's equation. Over their lifetime, galaxies are to a high degree collisionless; the DFs therefore satisfy the Collisionless Boltzmann equation (Sec. 2.1). With the help of Monte Carlo methods (Sec. 2.2.1), the evolution of the DF can be followed by N-body integrations (Sec. 2.2.2). When encounters are taken into account, one writes the collision term in Master equation form (Sec. 2.3.1) and expands in a Taylor series to derive the Fokker-Planck equation (Sec. 2.3.2).

2.1 Equilibrium model

2.1.1 DFs for collisionless stellar system

2.1.2 Collisionless Boltzmann equation

2.1.3 Preliminaries

Units conversion and scalings

2.2 N-body modelling

2.2.1 Monte Carlo integration

2.2.2 The CBE and N-body simulations

I. Initial conditions

II. Poisson solvers

III. Leap-frog integrator

Summary

2.3 Departure from equilibrium

2.3.1 Collision terms

2.3.2 Fokker-Planck equation

2.3.3 Relaxation time

Chapter 3

Multi-mass schemes

for collisionless N-body simulations

A general scheme for constructing Monte Carlo realizations of equilibrium, collisionless galaxy models with known distribution function (DF) f_0 is established. It uses importance sampling to find the sampling DF f_s that minimizes the mean-square formal errors in a given set of projections of the DF f_0. The result is a multi-mass N-body realization of the galaxy model in which "interesting" regions of phase-space are densely populated by lots of low-mass particles, increasing the effective N there, and less interesting regions by fewer, higher-mass particles.

The chapter is organized as follows. After recapping in the connection between N-body simulations and the CBE (Sec. 3.1.1) and presenting two possible weapons to fight against small N limitation (Sec. 3.1.2), we explain our multi-mass formulation in Sec. 3.2. In Sec. 3.3 we give two examples of using our scheme to suppress fluctuations in the monopole component of acceleration in spherical bulge models with or without a central MBH. We calculate formal estimates of the noise in N-body models constructed using equal-mass scheme and SHQ95's method, and compare them to our own scheme (Sec. 3.3.2). In Sec. 3.3.3 and 3.4 we test how well our realizations behave in practice when evolved using a real N-body code. For the bulge + MBH model in Sec. 3.4, much care has been taken to resolve the dynamics around the MBH.

3.1 Collisionless N-body simulations

3.1.1 N-body simulations and the CBE

3.1.2 How to fight against small N limitations?

3.2 Formulation

3.2.1 Observables

3.2.2 Optimal sampling scheme

3.2.3 ICs for N-body model

3.3 Comparisons of a bulge model (no MBH)

3.3.1 Formal errors

I. The conventional equal-mass scheme

II. Sigurdsson et al. 's multi-mass scheme

III. Our scheme

N-body realizations

3.3.2 How well is the acceleration field reproduced?

3.3.3 How well are integrals of motion conserved?

3.4 Simulations of a bulge + MBH model

3.4.1 N-body realizations

II. Block leapfrog time-stepping

3.4.2 Results: diffusion in J^2

Chapter 4

Loss cone refilling by flyby encounters

In the last chapter, we have developed a general scheme for constructing multi-mass collisionless galaxy models. It has been successfully applied to set up a bulge + MBH model, whose long-time behavior has also been verified by full N-body experiments. In this chapter, the MBH-embedded model is extended to include a loss cone (LC): a consumption sphere centred on the MBH. First of all, control tests have been directed to calibrate (artificial) noise-driven flux into the LC. Then starting from this near-equilibrium galaxy, satellites on flyby orbits are added as transient perturbers. For satellites with different mass and orbital parameters, I carry out extensive experiments to measure the mass of stars captured into the LC after a single flyby encounter. Given a set of satellite parameters, an empirical relationship is found to predict the LC refilling mass. Finally, to understand the interactions between the perturber and stars, especially to disentangle effects of resonance coupling from velocity impulse, I run extra test-particle experiments of orbiting satellites.

4.1 Loss cone refilling by two-body relaxation

What is the size of a loss cone?

How to refill a loss cone in spherical galaxies?

How to model a loss cone in N-body simulations?

4.2 Flyby encounters

4.2.1 Tests: calibrating noise-driven LC refilling

4.2.2 Experiments: measuring perturber-driven LC refilling

I. Toy perturbers

II. An example of flyby encounters

4.2.3 Results: an empirical $M_{\rm lc}$ formula

The validity of $M_{\rm lc}$ formula

4.2.4 Discussion

4.3 Where do LC stars come from?

4.3.1 Angular-momentum transport by satellite torque

4.3.2 Resonances from perturbation theory

4.3.3 Are resonances important?

Test-particle experiments of a periodic perturber

Chapter 5

Rates of MBH feeding in bulge-halo systems

In this chapter, I study the prospects for feeding the central MBH by orbiting halo substructures. I start by reviewing substructure properties observed in high-resolution cosmological N-body simulations, then summarize information on the subhalo spatial distribution, radial density profile, mass function and concentration parameters into a DF of the form $f_{\mathsf{sub}}(\mathcal{E}; M)$. In Sec. 5.2, I use the subhalo DF together with the knowledge of how much mass can be fed to a MBH after a single encounter to estimate the perturber-driven LC refilling rate for a typical small galaxy.

5.1 Modelling a Milky-way sized halo and its substructures

5.2 LC flux driven by noisy DM clumps

5.3 Discussions

Chapter 6

Conclusions and future studies

The motivation behind this thesis work was to improve our understanding of the internal dynamics at galactic centres, in particular, around super massive black holes. The best available tool on the dynamical study is undoubtedly full self-consistent N-body simulations. We have (1) developed a multi-mass scheme for constructing collisionless N-body models and (2) used the multi-mass `bulge + MBH` model to study loss cone dynamics. Below, I summarize results in earlier chapters and suggest some future work.

6.1 Constructing collisionless galaxy models

In Chapter 2, I presented the basic dynamical equations that govern the evolution of collisionless systems. Beginning with the collisionless Boltzmann equation that is of essential importance for system (Sec. 2.1.2), I show explicitly how the CBE is related to the N-body modelling (Sec. 2.2). When encounters are taken into account, one writes the collision term in Master equation form and expands in a Taylor series to derive the Fokker-Planck equation (Sec. 2.3).

Rather technical, Chapter 3 forms the backbone of the thesis. In it we saw how to design a sampling distribution function (DF) f_s from some known DF f_0 (Sec. 3.2.2) and how to generate a multi-mass collisionless model from it (Sec. 3.2.3). In two applications, a bulge model and a bulge + MBH model, we aim at minimizing the shot noise in estimates of the acceleration field. Models constructed using our multi-mass scheme easily yield a factor ~ 100 reduction in the variance at the central acceleration field when compared to a traditional equal-mass model with the same number of particles. When evolving both models with an N-body code, the diffusion coefficients in our model are reduced by a similar factor. Therefore, for certain types of problems, our scheme is a practical method for reducing the two-body relaxation effects, thereby bringing the N-body simulations closer to the collisionless ideal. We note the following preparation for the applications of multi-mass modelling scheme:

- For successful application, a system should be in a steady state, or close to one.
- The DF f_0 should be quick and cheap to evaluate, either numerically or analytically. Finding f_0 for axisymmetric or triaxial galaxies is a longstanding and nontrivial problem since one rarely has sufficient knowledge of the underlying potential's integrals of motion, but suitable flattened DFs do exist, including the standard axisymmetric

two-integral $f(\mathcal{E}, L_z)$ models and also rotating triaxial models such as those used in, e.g., Berczik et al. (2006) An alternative way of constructing flattened multi-mass realizations would be to apply Holley-Bockelmann et al. (2002)'s adiabatic sculpting scheme to a spherical N-body model constructed using our scheme.

- The general multi-mass scheme uses importance sampling to find the tailored sampling DF f_s that minimizes the sum of mean-square uncertainties in Q_i (of the form eq. **??**). As long as f_s is smooth in integral space, Monte Carlo realizations of f_s should work for any reasonably general collisionless N-body code. The utility of our multi-mass scheme, therefore, depends critically on the selection of the projection kernels $Q_i(\boldsymbol{w})$.

The last point is new to this field. It is probably best addressed by experimenting with different sets of kernels, especially since it is easy to test the consequences of modifying them. Nevertheless, there are cases in which modest physical insight offers some guidance on choosing the Q_i. Besides the loss cone problems addressed in Chapter 4, I here give another example for **future work**:

♡1. Sinking satellites Kazantzidis et al. (2004) demonstrate the significance of using equilibrium N-body realizations of satellite models when investigating the effect of tidal stripping of DM substructure halos (satellites) orbiting inside a more massive host potential. Besides the shape of the background potential and the amount of tidal heating, the mass-loss history is very sensitive to the detailed density profile of the satellite itself. One can therefore make one step further from equal-mass realizations by designing kernels to pick out *orbits that pass through the tidal radius*, while again maintaining an accurate estimate of the satellite's acceleration field.

6.2 Rates of loss cone refilling by MBHs

Chapter 4 describes applications of a multi-mass bulge + MBH model to study the loss cone (LC) dynamics. In Sec. 4.1, I introduced a loss cone consumption sphere to mimic tidal disruption events. The "empty" nature of the LC was then scrutinized by calibrating artificial LC refilling (Sec. 4.2.1). Toy models in Sec. 4.2.2 taught us that only a fairly massive satellite (M_s) passing through the centre (b) with low speed (V) can give rise to a LC flux well above the threshold of numerical noise-driven LC refilling. From the reduced satellite parameter space, about 100 experiments have been carried out to measure the maximum net mass (M_lc) captured into an initially empty LC. The collected data were **summarized** by a fitting M_lc-formula (**??**) in Sec. 4.2.3.

- Stellar orbits become strongly perturbed during a satellite flyby. The LC-captured mass reaches a peak value soon after the perturber visits its pericentre.
- M_lc is strongly correlated with the satellite parameters: scaling linearly with the satellite mass (M_s) and loss cone size (r_lc), but inversely with $b^{2.0}$ and $V^{1.3}$.
- As the satellite departs, stars settle down to a new equilibrium configuration within a few crossing times. Therefore, if perturbed by cumulative perturbers, one can simply accumulate each single event to get the total consumed mass.

The rest of the Chapter 4 is devoted to understanding numerical results: where do LC stars come from? Linear perturbation theory claims that resonances are important if not most important in determining the response of a stellar system to any external perturbation (Sec. 4.3.2). But for the flyby encounters of interest, could resonances be the culprit for redistributing angular-momentum in stars and eventually send stars to the LC? This was addressed in Sec. 4.3.3, where test-particle experiments were carried out to track resonant dynamics relevant to a periodic driver. I make the following **summaries**:

- Close encounters with the satellite effectively change angular-momentum of stars. The ones that lose enough angular-momentum can be effectively deflected into the loss cone and destroyed by falling into the MBH.
- A flyby encounter does not repeat its pattern, which prevents stars in instantaneous resonance from building up a significant response. Therefore, resonance coupling between stars and the external perturber is unimportant in terms of refilling the emptied loss cone.
- The accelerated angular-momentum relaxation within a nearly Keplerian is also unimportant here.

In Chapter 5, I introduced an outer halo as a reservoir to continuously inject orbiting subhalos into the inner bulge. One further step was made by describing the subhalo properties in terms of phase-space probability density, containing all the dynamical information (Sec. 5.1). Finally in Sec. 5.2, I put things together to predict a LC refilling rate. The conclusion is:

- The flux of stars into the loss cone is **enhanced** when the loss cone is initially emptied, but due to the scarcity of subhalo population near the galactic centre, the LC refilling rate averaged over the entire orbiting dark halo substructures is **not** strongly affected.

The future

For the galaxy model being used in the entire thesis, I have introduced several simplifications. At this point, I bring some notes about possible improvements and extensions of the current model.

♡2. Better galaxy models The galaxy model used in this thesis is not ideal: (a) the mass of the MBH is considerably larger than those observed in galactic centres and the effective radius ($r_{\rm lc}$) of the LC is many orders of magnitude larger than the tidal radius in real galaxies. Unfortunately, it is still hard for simulations to determine accurately the flux of stars into a small MBH or a tiny LC. The only remedy is to increase the number of particles, the more the better. (b) The adopted Hernquist profile has a r^{-1} central cusp and no alternatives, such as core (shallower) or nucleus (steeper) profiles, have been explored here. It would be useful to extend the work in this thesis by building N-body models with different mass profiles, MBH masses and LC sizes.

♡3. Evolution of binary supermassive black holes Larger elliptical galaxies and bulges grow through mergers. If more than one of the progenitors contains a MBH and the in-spiral time is less than a Hubble time, the MBHs will form a bound system. Begelman, Blandford & Rees (1980) showed that the evolution of binary MBHs in gas-poor galaxies can be divided into three phases: (a) As galaxies merge, the core undergoes violent relaxation. Via dynamical friction (Chandrasekhar 1943), the captured MBH sinks towards the center of the common gravitational potential where they form a bound binary. (b) The binary continues to decay via gravitational slingshot interactions (Saslaw, Valtonen & Aarseth 1974): stars on orbits intersecting the binary are ejected at much higher velocities comparable to the binary's orbital velocity. (c) Finally **if** the binary's separation decreases to the point at which gravitational radiation becomes the dominant dissipative force to carry away the last remaining energy and angular momentum, the binaries coalesce rapidly (Peters 1964). The long-term evolution of MBH binaries is always related to a long standing problem called the "final parsec problem" (Milosavljević & Merritt 2003b): is super-elastic scattering off individual stars in the background efficient enough to transit a binary MBH from dynamical friction regime on the order of 1pc scale, to the gravitational radiation dominated regime with a separation $\leq 10^{-3}$pc and finally merge within a Hubble time?

Uncertainties about the resolution have been a major impediment to predicting the frequency of MBH mergers in galactic nuclei, and hence to computing event rates for proposed gravitational wave interferometers like LISA.[1] As a natural continuation of the work in Chapter 5, I intend to further explore the use of M_{lc}-fitting-formula for the evolution of binary MBHs.

♡4. Response of galaxy to perturbations   Our conclusion that resonances are **unimportant** in redistributing angular-momentum within stars, is in disagreement with Vesperini & Weinberg (2000), who explore the effects of relatively weak encounters by computing the response of a spherical stellar system to the perturbation induced by a low-mass system during a flyby. They determine the contribution to the total self-consistent response from three sources: (a) the perturbation applied by the external perturber; (b) the reaction of the system to its own response to this perturbation; (c) the excitation of discrete damped modes of the primary system; and conclude that *it is the resonances* (point c) *that lead to the excitation of patterns in the primary system.* The main discrepancies probably stem from the galaxy model under study, since all their conclusions are based on a very strong assumption: discrete modes are weakly damped in *King* models with different concentrations. On the theoretical side, I intend to explore the response of galaxy to external perturbations by means of linear perturbation theory, hopefully to find out whether weakly-damped modes exist in every galaxy.

---

[1] http://lisa.jpl.nasa.gov/

Bibliography

[1] Aarseth S. J. 1985, Dynamics of Star Clusters, 113, 251

[2] Ahmad A., & Cohen L. 1973, ApJ, 179, 885

[3] Baes M., Dejonghe H., & Buyle P. 2005, A&A, 432, 411

[4] Barr P., & Mushotzky R. F., 1986, Nature, 320, 421

[5] Bahcall J. N., Kirhakos S., Saxe D. H., & Schneider D. P., 1997, ApJ, 479, 642

[6] Barnes J., & Hut P., 1986, Nature, 324, 446

[7] Begelman M. C., Blandford R. D., & Rees M. J. 1980, Nature287, 307

[8] Begelman M. C. 2001, ApJ, 551, 897

[9] Berczik P., Merritt D., & Spurzem R., 2005, ApJ, 633, 680

[10] Berczik P., Merritt D., Spurzem R., & Bischof H.-P., 2006, ApJ, 642, L21

[11] Berezinsky V., Dokuchaev V., & Eroshenko Y. 2006, Phys. Rev. D, 73, 063504

[12] Binney J., & Tremaine S., 2008, Galactic Dynamics: Second Edition. Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ. (**BT08**)

[13] Bissantz N., Englmaier P., Binney J., & Gerhard O. 1997, MNRAS, 289, 651

[14] Blandford R. D., Netzer H., Woltjer L., Courvoisier T. J.-L., & Mayor M., 1990, Active Galactic Nuclei

[15] Bogdanović T., Eracleous M., Mahadevan S., Sigurdsson S., & Laguna P., 2004, ApJ, 610, 707

[16] van den Bosch F. C., Lewis G. F., Lake G., & Stadel J. 1999, ApJ, 515, 50

[17] Bullock J. S., Kolatt T. S., Sigad Y., Somerville R. S., Kravtsov A. V., Klypin A. A., Primack J. R., & Dekel A.,2001, MNRAS, 321, 559

[18] Chandrasekhar S., 1943, ApJ, 97, 255

[19] Chokshi A., & Turner E. L. 1992, MNRAS, 259, 421

[20] Cohn H., & Kulsrud R.M., 1978, ApJ, 226, 1087

[21] Cornfeld I., Fomin S., and Sinai Ya. G. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1982. (Appendix 3 in Ergodic Theory)

[22] Côté, P., et al. 2004, ApJS, 153, 223

[23] Danzmann K. 2003, Advances in Space Research, 32, 1233

[24] Dehnen W., 1993, MNRAS, 265 250D

[25] Dehnen W., 2000, ApJL536, L39

[26] Dehnen W., 2001, MNRAS, 324, 273

[27] Diemand J., Moore B., & Stadel J. 2005, Nature, 433, 389

[28] Diemand J., Kuhlen M., & Madau P. 2006, ApJ, 649, 1

[29] Diemand J., Kuhlen M., & Madau P., 2007a, ApJ, 657, 262

[30] Diemand J., Kuhlen M., & Madau P., 2007b, ApJ, 667, 859

[31] Edelson R. A., et al. 1996, ApJ, 470, 364

[32] Faber S. M., et al. 1997, AJ, 114, 1771

[33] Ferrarese L., & Merritt D., 2000, ApJ, 539, L9

[34] Ferrarese L., & Ford H. 2005, Space Science Reviews, 116, 523

[35] Ferrarese L., et al. 2006, ApJL, 644, L21

[36] Ford H. C., Tsvetanov Z. I., Ferrarese L., & Jaffe W. 1998, The Central Regions of the Galaxy and Galaxies, 184, 377

[37] Frank J., & Rees M. J., 1976, MNRAS, 176, 633

[38] Frank J., 1978, MNRAS, 184, 87

[39] Gao L., White S. D. M., Jenkins, A., Stoehr F., & Springel V. 2004, MNRAS, 355, 819

[40] Gao L., White S. D. M., Jenkins, A., Frenk C. S., & Springel V. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 379

[41] Gerhard O. E., & Binney J. J., 1985, MNRAS, 216, 467

[42] Gebhardt K., Bender R., Bower G., Dressler A., Faber S.M.,et al., 2000, ApJ, 539, L13

[43] Gebhardt K., et al. 2003, ApJ, 583, 92

[44] Ghez A. M., Salim S., Hornstein S. D., Tanner A., Lu J. R., Morris, M., Becklin E. E., & Duchêne G. 2005, ApJ, 620, 744

[45] Green A. M., Hofmann S., & Schwarz D. J. 2004, MNRAS, 353, L23

[46] Green A. M., Hofmann S., & Schwarz D. J. 2005, Journal of Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics, 8, 3

[47] Häring N., & Rix H.-W. 2004, ApJL, 604, L89

[48] Hernquist L., 1990, ApJ, 356, 359

[49] Hernquist L., & Ostriker J.R., 1992, ApJ, 386, 375H

[50] Ho L., 1999, Observational Evidence for the Black Holes in the Universe 234, 157

[51] Holley-Bockelmann K., Mihos, J. C., Sigurdsson S., Hernquist L., & Norman C., 2002, ApJ, 567, 817

[52] Holley-Bockelmann K., Weinberg M., & Katz N. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 991

[53] Holley-Bockelmann K., & Sigurdsson S., 2006, arXiv:astro-ph/0601520

[54] Hopman C., & Alexander T., 2006, ApJ, 645, 1152

[55] Ivanov P. B., & Chernyakova M. A.,2006, A&A, 448, 843

[56] Jenkins A., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., Colberg J. M., Cole S., Evrard A. E., Couchman H. M. P., & Yoshida N. 2001, MNRAS, 321, 372

[57] Kawai A., Fukushige T., Makino J., & Taiji M. 2000, PASJ, 52, 659

[58] Kazantzidis S., Mayer L., Mastropietro C., Diemand J., Stadel J., & Moore B., 2004, ApJ, 608, 663

[59] Kazantzidis S., Magorrian J., & Moore B., 2004, ApJ, 601, 37

[60] Klypin A., Zhao H., & Somerville R. S., 2002, ApJ, 573, 597

[61] Komossa S., Halpern J., Schartel N., Hasinger G., Santos-Lleo M., & Predehl P., 2004, ApJL, 603, L17

[62] Kormendy J., & Richstone D., 1995, ARA&A, 33, 581

[63] Kormendy J. 2004, Coevolution of Black Holes and Galaxies, 1

[64] Krolik J. H. 1999, Active galactic nuclei: from the central black hole to the galactic environment /Julian H. Krolik. Princeton N. J. : Princeton University Press, c1999.

[65] Lee H.M., 1999, in "'Observational Evidence for Black Holes in the Universe", ed. S.K. Chakrabarti (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 187

[66] Leeuwin F., Combes, F., & Binney J. 1993, MNRAS, 262, 1013

[67] Levin Y., Wu A., & Thommes E. 2005, ApJ, 635, 341

[68] Levin Y., 2007, MNRAS, 374, 515

[69] Lightman A.P., & Shapiro S.L., 1977, ApJ, 211, 244

[70] Loveday J., Peterson B. A., Efstathiou G., & Maddox S. J. 1992, ApJ, 390, 338

[71] Lynden-Bell D., 1969, Nature, 223, 690

[72] Lynden-Bell D., 1978, *Physica Scripta*, 17, 185

[73] Magorrian J., Tremaine S., Richstone D., Bender R., Bower G., et al., 1998, AJ, 115, 2285

[74] Magorrian J., & Tremaine S., 1999, MNRAS309, 447 (**MT99**)

[75] Magorrian J. 2007, MNRAS, 381, 1663

[76] Marconi A., & Hunt L. K. 2003, ApJL, 589, L21

[77] Marconi A., Risaliti G., Gilli R., Hunt L. K., Maiolino R., & Salvati M. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 169

[78] McMillan P. J., & Dehnen W., 2005, MNRAS, 363, 1205

[79] Merritt D., & Quinlan G. D., 1998, ApJ, 498, 625

[80] Merritt D., & Ferrarese L., 2001, MNRAS, 320, L30

[81] Merritt D., & Poon M.,2004, ApJ, 606..788

[82] Merritt D., & Milosavljević, M., 2005, Living Reviews in Relativity 8, 8

[83] Merritt D., Mikkola S., & Szell A., 2007, ApJ, 671, 53

[84] Miller M. C. 2006, MNRAS, 367, L32

[85] Milosavljević M.,& Merritt D., 2003a, ApJ, 596, 860

[86] Milosavljević, M., & Merritt D., 2003b, The Astrophysics of Gravitational Wave Sources, 686, 201

[87] Moore B., Diemand J., Stadel J., & Quinn T., 2005, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints, arXiv:astro-ph/0502213

[88] Murali C. 1999, ApJ, 519, 580

[89] Navarro J. F., Frenk C. S., & White S. D. M., 1996, ApJ, 462, 563

[90] Neto A. F., et al. 2007, MNRAS, 381, 1450

[91] Norman C., & Silk J., 1983, ApJ, 266, 502

[92] Perets H. B., Hopman C., & Alexander, T. 2007, ApJ, 656, 709

[93] Perets H. B., & Alexander T. 2008, ApJ, 677, 146

[94] Peters P. C. 1964, Physical Review, 136, 1224

[95] Pieri L., Bertone G., & Branchini E. 2008, MNRAS, 384, 1627

[96] Polnarev A. G. & Rees M. J. 1994, A&A, 283, 301

[97] Pounds K. A., Nandra K., Stewart G. C., George I. M., & Fabian A. C. 1990, Nature, 344, 132

[98] Press W.H., Flannery B.P., Teukolsky S.A.,Vetterling W.T., 1992, Numerical Recipes in C, 2nd edn. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge

[99] Rauch K. P., & Tremaine S., 1996, New Astronomy, 1, 149

[100] Rauch K. P., & Ingalls B., 1998, MNRAS, 299, 1231

[101] Reed D., Governato F., Quinn T., Gardner J., Stadel J., & Lake G. 2005, MNRAS, 359, 1537

[102] Rees M.J., 1984, ARA&A, 22, 471R

[103] Rees M.J., 1988, Nature333, 523

[104] Rees M. J. 1998, Black Holes and Relativistic Stars, 79

[105] Reynolds C. 2005, Nature, 438, 32

[106] Richstone D. O., & Tremaine S. 1985, ApJ, 296, 370

[107] Richstone D., et al., 1998, Nature, 395, A14

[108] Saha P., & Tremaine S., 1992, AJ, 104, 1633

[109] Saslaw W. C., Valtonen M. J., & Aarseth S. J. 1974, ApJ, 190, 253

[110] Salpeter E. E. 1964, ApJ, 140, 796

[111] Schwarzschild K. 1916, Abh. Konigl. Preuss. Akad. Wissenschaften Jahre 1906,92, Berlin 1907, 189

[112] Schmidt M. 1963, Nature, 197, 1040

[113] Sellwood J. A., 1983, Journal of Computational Physics, 50, 337

[114] Sellwood J. A., 1987, Annual review of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 25, 151

[115] Sellwood J. A., 2002, in The shapes of galaxies and their dark halos, Proceedings of the Yale Cosmology Workshop ”The Shapes of Galaxies and Their Dark Matter Halos”, New Haven, Connecticut, USA, 28-30 May 2001. Edited by Priyamvada Natarajan. Singapore: World Scientific, 2002, ISBN 9810248482, p.123, ed. P. Natarajan, 123–+

[116] Sellwood J. A., 2008, ApJ, 679, 379

[117] Shlosman I., Begelman M. C., & Frank J. 1990, Nature345, 679

[118] Sigurdsson S., Hernquist L., & Quinlan G. D., 1995, ApJ, 446, 75 (**SHQ95**)

[119] Sigurdsson S., & Rees M.J., 1997, MNRAS, 284, 318

[120] Soltan A., 1982, MNRAS, 200, 115

[121] Springel V., & White S. D. M. 1999, MNRAS, 307, 162

[122] Syer D., & Ulmer A., 1999, MNRAS, 306, 35

[123] Theis C. 1998, A&A, 330, 1180

[124] Tremaine S., & Weinberg M. D., 1984, MNRAS, 209, 729

[125] Tremaine S., Richstone D. O., Byun Y. I.,Dressler A., Faber S. M., Grillmair C., Kormendy J., & Lauer T. R., 1994, AJ, 107, 634

[126] Tremaine S., Gebhardt K., Bender R., Bower G., Dressler A.,Faber S.M., *et al.*, 2002, ApJ, 574, 740

[127] Tsiklauri D., Viollier R.D., 1998, ApJ, 500, 591

[128] Ulmer A., 1999, ApJ, 514, 180

[129] Vesperini E., & Weinberg M. D., 2000, ApJ, 534, 598

[130] Wang J., & Merritt D., 2004, ApJ, 600, 149

[131] Weinberg M. D., 1994, ApJ, 421, 481

[132] Weinberg M. D., & Katz N. 2007a, MNRAS, 375, 425

[133] Weinberg M. D., & Katz N., 2007b, MNRAS, 375, 460

[134] Whittam G.B., 1974, Linear & Non-Linear Waves. Wiley-Interscience New York

[135] Wyse R. F. G., Gilmore G., & Franx M., 1997, Annual review of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 35, 637

[136] Young P. J., Shields G. A., & Wheeler J. C. 1977, ApJ, 212, 367

[137] Yu Q., 2002, MNRAS, 331, 935

[138] Yu Q., & Tremaine S., 2002, MNRAS, 335, 965

[139] Zel'Dovich Y. B. 1964, Soviet Physics Doklady 9, 195

[140] Zemp M., Moore B., Stadel J., Carollo C. M., & Madau P., 2008, MNRAS, 386, 1543

[141] Zhao H., Haehnelt M. G., & Rees M. J. 2002, New Astronomy, 7, 385

[142] Zhao H., Taylor J. E., Silk J., & Hooper D., 2005, arXiv:astro-ph/0502049

[143] **Zhang M.**, & Magorrian J. 2008, MNRAS, 387, 1719